

Illinois U Library Town Meeting

AUGUST 11, 1953
78th BROADCAST



BULLETIN OF AMERICA'S TOWN MEETING OF THE AIR

Broadcast by 310 Stations of the ABC Radio Network

U. S. Pat. Off.

Reg. U. S. Pat. Off.

What Has the Eisenhower Administration Accomplished?

Moderator:
GUNNAR BACK

Speakers

MIKE MONRONEY

HUGH SCOTT



COMING

—August 18, 1953—

What Have We Learned From Korea?

Published by THE TOWN HALL, Inc., New York 36, N.Y.

VOLUME 19, NUMBER 15



\$5.00 A YEAR, 25c A COPY



Town Meeting

VOLUME 19

No. 15



What Has the Eisenhower Administration Accomplished?

The Broadcast of August 11, 1953, from 9:00 to 9:45 P.M., E.S.T., over the American Broadcasting Company Radio Network, originated from the ABC Studios, 39 W. 66th Street, New York City, N. Y.

The account of the meeting reported in this Bulletin was transcribed from recordings made of the actual broadcast and represents the exact content of the meeting as nearly as such mechanism permits. The publishers and printer are not responsible for the statements of the speakers or the points of views presented.

THE SPEAKERS' COLUMN

SENATOR A. S. MIKE MONRONEY—Democrat of Oklahoma. Senator Monroney is a former newspaperman, having served for five years as reporter and political writer with the *Oklahoma News*. He is one of the founders and co-authors of the annual *Oklahoma Press Gridiron*, and has written various articles for national magazines and newspaper syndicates. Following retirement from newspaper work, he took over his father's business and still serves as President and Manager of the Monroney Furniture Company, Oklahoma City. Elected to Congress in 1939, he served in the House of Representatives until 1950 when he was elected to the Senate. For his work on legislative reorganization, international cooperation and domestic stabilization, Senator Monroney received the first *Colliers Award for Distinguished Congressional Service* given any House Member in 1946. The University of Oklahoma, from which he graduated with a B.A. in 1924, awarded him a citation for distinguished service in 1948.

His legislative interests have ranged from flood control, to tightening and modernizing the 25-year old *Corrupt Practices Act* for clean elections to inflation and Congressional budget control.

REPRESENTATIVE HUGH D. SCOTT, JR.—Republican of Pennsylvania. Hugh D. Scott, Jr. received his A.B. from Randolph Macon College in 1919 and his LL.B. from the University of Virginia in 1922. He also attended the University of Pennsylvania. He was admitted to the Pennsylvania Bar in 1922, later becoming a member of the firm White, Williams and Scott, Philadelphia. From 1926-41 he served as Assistant District Attorney. He was elected Representative to the United States Congress in November, 1940, and has been re-elected to each successive term except in 1944.

Representative Scott has seen service in the Army, Merchant Marine and Navy in World War I and II. The latter included duty with the North Atlantic Patrol and in the Pacific. In the summer of 1944, he enlisted incognito as a merchant marine on a tanker and visited American soldiers and sailors in Great Britain and France.

During the year 1948-49, Representative Scott was National Chairman of the Republican Party. Last year he was chairman of regional organization and later a member of the personal staff for President Eisenhower. Now in his sixth Congressional term, Mr. Scott is serving on the Rules Committee.

Town Meeting is published weekly at 32 S. Fourth St., Columbus 15, Ohio, by The Town Hall, Inc., New York 36, New York. Send subscriptions and single copy orders to **Town Hall, New York 36, N.Y.**

Subscription price, \$5.00 a year, (Canada, \$6.00); six months, \$3.00, (Canada, \$3.50); six weeks, \$1.00, (Canada, \$1.20); 25c a single copy. Entered as second-class matter May 9, 1942, at the Post Office at Columbus, Ohio, under the Act of March 3, 1879.

What Has the Eisenhower Administration Accomplished?

Moderator Back:

We have had just a little more than a week to stand off a bit and have a look at the work of the first session of the 83rd Congress. The guns in Korea haven't been quiet for very much longer than that. The two events have come together to provide a stopping point at which we can debate tonight's Town Meeting question: "What Has the Eisenhower Administration Accomplished?" The President has filed his report. He spoke of two precious victories, one in Korea, and looking toward Capitol Hill, he listed a dozen accomplishments of the Congress. He thought all had gone very well indeed, but he said he and all the others on his team would not be so foolish as to believe that they had seen all and conquered all the problems of our nation.

Many of the other reports are also in. Joe Martin of Massachusetts, Republican Speaker of the House, has made his. The Administration, he thought, had made a great start toward reversing the world-wide trend toward total statism. Sam Rayburn, a seasoned Democratic leader of the House and so long its Speaker, left a statement saying that the Eisenhower Administration had failed to keep every campaign promise except that of providing hard money, making money harder to get, and with that Mr. Rayburn went on home to Texas.

Town Meeting's report tonight comes from two members of Congress whose voices were often vigorously heard in the action that made the record of the first session. Hugh D. Scott, Jr., Republican from Pennsylvania, was an

early Eisenhower man and one of his strategists in the campaign. A lawyer by training, Representative Scott came to Congress in 1940. He is a veteran of the two world wars. During the year 1948-49 Hugh Scott, you will recall, was Chairman of the Republican National Committee and was Chairman of the Eisenhower Headquarters Committee from election to inauguration day.

Senator Mike Monroney, the Oklahoma Democrat, served in the House of Representatives from 1939 until his election to the Senate in 1950. Mike Monroney's name was closely associated with improving the machinery of government. He was co-author in 1946 of the Legislative Reorganization Act, the effects of which have continued in improving the operations of Congress. Senator Monroney is a former newspaper man. He later went into business in Oklahoma City where he continues to head a furniture company founded by his father. Tonight, first on the question: "What Has the Eisenhower Administration Accomplished?" here is Congressman Hugh Scott of Pennsylvania.

Congressman Scott:

Thank you, Gunnar. First of all, let me say it is a great privilege to be here with you and with my friend, Mike Monroney, who is without doubt one of the ablest members of the United States Congress. Let me say first of all that the Eisenhower Administration brings something new to the federal government. For the first time in many years, an administration has kept, and is keeping, its platform promises. The federal government has grown too big

and too powerful. The Eisenhower Administration is reversing this trend. We are moving toward the contraction of a central government which has been eating us out of house and home.

On the legislative side, we are steadily putting our house in order. We have cut 14 billion dollars from the amounts requested by the outgoing President, Mr. Truman. We have kept our promise that the budget must first be brought into balance in order that we may be able to make tax reductions to the American taxpayer at the earliest possible date. Had we not saved the money the previous administration asked for, we would be 14 billion dollars further away from our determination to assure the government of a balanced budget and to assure the taxpayer of income tax relief, in that order.

The Congress has passed ten reorganization plans to improve the efficiency of the federal government in line with the recommendations of the second Hoover Commission. Of the eleven-point Ike program seven of these promises were kept in the very first session. In my opinion the other four will be kept in the second session. The removal of restrictions on the buying and selling of goods has not only held the cost of living steady but has encouraged increased confidence in government and in its relations to the free flow of trade. A survey of current business shows that in the second quarter of 1953 the consumer had eight per cent more purchasing power than in the second quarter of 1952.

President Eisenhower has gone boldly and vigorously about the keeping of his campaign promises. Through his remarkable facility for getting people to work together, he has gone further than any of his

predecessors in recognizing the rights, powers, and sensibilities of members of Congress. Time and again he has saved important items on his legislative program despite the paper-thin majorities in both houses, notwithstanding some obstruction at times from members of both parties. In the field of civil rights, the President has abolished segregation in all schools on military reservations operating with federal funds, has directed the Attorney General to intervene in support of laws forbidding segregation in the District of Columbia, and has recognized in his appointments to important posts all races and creeds who make up this great America.

Far and away the greatest accomplishment of President Eisenhower has been to keep his promise that he would find a way to end the killing of American boys in Korea. This, I think, is a very important point. The so-called softer policy of the Russians is directly related to the stronger and more forceful and more imaginative policy of the Americans, which began with the inauguration of President Eisenhower last January.

Now all in all, in my opinion, it will take a lot of doing to clean out all the dirt which has been swept under the federal rugs in the last twenty years, but in seven months we have made an effective start. We have suffered some setbacks but the fact remains that today we have a better government, administered by abler men, at less expense and with more concern for you, Mr. Average Taxpayer, than we had this time last year.

Mr. Back: Thank you, Congressman Hugh Scott of Pennsylvania, for your analysis of the work of the first session of the 83rd Con-

gress. Now here is the analysis of a Democrat, Senator Mike Monroney of Oklahoma. Senator Monroney.

Senator Monroney:

Thank you, Gunnar Back, for giving me this chance to appear on this fine program. I am glad to be back with my good friend, Hugh Scott; we served in the House for ten very pleasant years together. The Republican Party made many promises last October and November in its drive to win the election. Outstanding among these copious promises were that it would balance the budget, cut taxes, and strengthen defense. The first six months of the session have rolled by. The budget is farther out of balance than it has been for years. The tax reductions have blown away, and our defense has been drastically reduced.

I disagree with my very close friend, Hugh, on the idea that the soft policy of the Russians was generated in Washington. I think it was Mr. Stalin's death, rather than Mr. Dulles's birth as Secretary of State, that caused this change. I rather disagree that the splendid relationship of President Eisenhower with his Congress, particularly the Republican branch of the Congress, has made a very fine working arrangement, since it has been Democratic votes that have saved the President on all of his foreign policy programs and on his excess profits tax extension.

On the expense item, the \$14,000,000,000 shrinks to about \$12,800,000,000 on the cold hard facts of accounting; and the Republican bookkeepers, I am afraid, are like the bookkeepers that play the races. They keep books in their own way, and I think the Republicans are looking ahead to a race

next November and keeping their books accordingly. Every Republican speaker has boasted about such programs as extension of reorganization powers, reciprocal trade, the materials controls, extension of the excess profits tax, extension of the international wheat agreement, aid in defense-area schools, and wheat for Pakistan.

It strikes me that these choice claims are a part of a previous Democratic program, programs that were condemned in rather purple language all during the campaign. Anyway, we Democrats do not condemn their passage; we are glad that the Republicans have found them to be desirable after election, even though they didn't approve of them before. We did condemn the tendency to give away our natural resources, such as the tidelands oil, passage by the House giving away rights to Niagara Falls to private companies, the weakening of REA generating and transmission facilities, the killing of the provision of oil for education in the off-shore areas, the weakening of our national defense. We also condemn the unfinished symphony attitude that most of the Republicans have had on this Congress.

The Republican promises of social progress were pushed to the back of the stove and left to simmer until next session. We anticipate that in an election year most of these promised reforms, such as extension of social security, revision of the Taft-Hartley Act, rewriting the McCarran Immigration Law, balanced budget, a sound tax program and a farm program, will all be simmering on the back of the stove still when Congress adjourns next year.

In this policy of drift, the

Republicans have invited a farm depression by a complete do-nothing attitude. In spite of collapsing farm prices, consumers still have to pay higher costs than ever for their food. Republicans have launched a tight money policy. It has greatly restricted small business. Certainly the American people in voting for the new crusade expected greater results than molehills of legislation and mountains of McCarthyism. (*applause*)

Mr. Back: Thank you, Senator Monroney of Oklahoma. Congressman Scott, I suppose I need do no more than say go ahead.

Congressman Scott: Well, Gunnar, the first thing that occurs to me is that the sum and substance of everything that our friend, Mike Monroney, has said here is that so far this isn't really a very good program which has been adopted, but the votes of Democrats made it all possible. Now that is a very interesting attitude. In other words you don't like it, but you wouldn't have had it at all if the Democrats hadn't voted for it, which I deny on both counts. I like it, and in most of these cases, as Senator Margaret Chase Smith said in her column yesterday, the interesting thing is that it was not votes of Democrats that made most of these things possible.

A few, yes, but I don't know whether our audience realizes that the votes that were taken on the reorganization bill to enable Ike to keep his promises to reorganize and streamline and save money in this government, were made possible by votes of more Republican Senators than by Democratic Senators. The majority of the Republicans voted for them and the majority of the Democrats against. Likewise, on many of the appropriations bills a majority of Repub-

licans voted for, a majority of Democrats against. I don't want to take up too much time, but if we are going to talk about Stalin I will come back with a quote for Mike later.

Mr. Monroney: Well, I would like to say to my friend, Hugh, that the big reorganization bill, the extension of the power to reorganize the government, that it was the Democrats who insisted that President Eisenhower should have the same powers that President Truman had, while the Republicans in the House didn't want to give them to him. Of course these ten individual reorganization programs, many of which came up just to let Mr. Benson reorganize the Agriculture Department, not saying how, when, why, or what they were going to do, the Democrats had not too much enthusiasm about that kind of blank check.

On the large thing that means something to the next generation, the foreign-policy votes had been predominantly Democratic, Hugh, in the Senate and also in the House. I have them here, I don't want to bore the audience with them, but it shows the very heavy preponderance of Democratic strength and a very close division of Republican votes.

Congressman Scott: Mike, the big difference in foreign policy between Republicans and Democrats—and we would be kidding ourselves if we said it was not true that both parties have to continue a foreign policy devoted to strengthening the hand of the United States against its enemies abroad, and both parties are bound to continue the general tendency of the government to defend itself, and to secure as many allies as possible. But here is the big difference: your party made the

mistake over too many years of trusting the good will of people like Stalin. Now the Republican Party began in this administration by *not* trusting Stalin, by not trusting Malenkov, by assuming the initiative—the dynamic, forceful initiative—in indicating to the Russians that we weren't fooling.

Here comes my quote and this was said by a previous Democratic President, and no Republican ever said it as far as I know. If you ever heard of a Republican who said this tell me, Mike. Here is the quote, "I believe he (Stalin) was truly representative of the heart and soul of Russia and I believe that we are going to get along very well with him and the Russian people, very well indeed." That's what was wrong with your foreign policy, you trusted the wrong people. (*applause*)

Senator Monroney: I believe I recall a pretty good quote from Senator Joseph McCarthy, that said he thought that Mr. Stalin was very sincere and he meant business and good will on the disarmament program that he was proposing at that time.

Congressman Scott: You're not going to get anywhere in this program by hitting me over the head with McCarthy.

Senator Monroney: Well, Hugh just got through saying that he didn't know of any Republicans that have been so quoted. Now the biggest reversal I think President Eisenhower has had was in his first foreign policy resolution, when he sent up the condemnation of Russia for the enslavement of free peoples. That dealt with Russia's violation of Yalta and Potsdam Agreements. The House passed it; the Foreign Affairs Committee passed it unanimously. It got to the Senate and it conflicted with

all the speeches that the Senators had made about Yalta, and that resolution, which was supposed to be the first step of this beauteous foreign policy, is still sleeping in the Senate Committee without any action from the Republican Senate, although Mr. Dulles said it was going to be as great as the Monroe Doctrine if we had enacted it.

Congressman Scott: Mike, let's go back to the way the Democrats always help us out. You have as many Senators as we have, why didn't *you* bring it out?

Senator Monroney: Well, we don't have control of the Foreign Relations Committee. You had the organization. If the chairman doesn't choose to bring it up, you know the legislative procedure as well as I do. It's still sleeping.

Congressman Scott: Any majority in the committee, whether it is made of Republicans or Democrats, can bring it out.

Mr. Back: May I, Congressman Scott and Senator Monroney, go back to your opening statements? I made some notes side by side. I think the last thing you said, Congressman Scott, was that you felt that President Eisenhower had kept his promise and ended the killing of our boys in Korea and you attribute that to the dynamic and more forceful policy. Senator Monroney, shall we turn to the question of Korea and then go on to the other matter, such as who kept the promise of balancing the budget and who didn't?

Senator Monroney: Well, I think of course every American heart is praying tonight for a real peace in Korea, and, partisan though I might be, I do not intend to put one single straw in the way of President Eisenhower and Secretary of State Dulles in trying to bring that to a satisfactory conclusion. It

is a difficult job at the most. We had that job to try to do and we know from bitter experience what partisan politics can do to handicap it. And I am awfully glad that no member of my party has risen in the Senate to condemn or to disparage in any way the armistice that has been signed. Let's hope and pray that it will mean not only the cessation of killing but the establishment of peace in that war-torn country.

Mr. Back: Thank you, Senator. Congressman Scott, the Senator said that the Administration had failed to balance the budget, and you said that it had kept its promise, and was moving forward toward that. Is there any argument, gentlemen, on that?

Congressman Scott: Yes, let's go into that a minute. What I said is that we are moving toward the balancing of the budget. We are moving more rapidly toward it than any previous administration, but it has to be remembered that we inherited approximately 80 billions of dollars of unpaid bills, which Mr. Truman left on the President's desk when he went back to Independence, Missouri. Now what do we do about those unpaid bills? We have to meet them. That means the taxpayers have to meet them and what do we do?

In the eighty-third Congress, and I am holding up a letter by John Taber, Chairman of the Appropriations Committee, the final budget is \$54,500,000,000. That is, \$14,082,000,000 below the Truman budget. It is \$4,578,000,000 below the amount recommended by President Eisenhower, because the Congress has the final say as to how much shall be appropriated. And here is an interesting fact; it is \$20,810,000,000 below last year's appropriations by the second session of the 82nd Democratic Congress.

How much does that \$14,000,000,000 mean to each one of you listening to this program? It is approximately 80 dollars to every man, woman, and child in America, and if there are five in your family you have been saved \$400 by the actions of the Republican Congress and, brother, that ain't hay!

Mr. Back: Senator Monroney.

Senator Monroney: As I said before it is all in the way that the bookkeeper keeps the books on that.

Congressman Scott: Do you deny that it is right?

Senator Monroney: I certainly do. I will be glad to break that down. You borrowed 2 billion dollars in appropriated funds for defense and made it apply on the pay for the Army and Navy, so you didn't appropriate 2 billions; it was actually due and had been appropriated previously.

Congressman Scott: Now we don't have to spend it.

Senator Monroney: Then you are going to have 2 billion dollars fewer airplanes; that is an additional cut.

Congressman Scott: Could I interrupt by pointing out that of this budget this year—of the sixty billion including the carry over, fifty-four plus—of the sixty billion dollar budget, 48 billion was for defense. That is a whole lot of money going into ammunition and guns out of the total.

Senator Monroney: And that is what we tried to tell the people during the campaign last October and November, that the Republicans were going to save billions of dollars, and we find now, when these defense cuts come through, actually \$12,800,000,000, you've cut roughly \$9,500,000,000 out of our

own defense and that of our fighting allies. You cut \$500,000,000 dollars out of the atomic energy program. There is a flat ten billion of that \$12,800,000,000 that is out of fighting equipment. You cut another billion and a half out of such things as postponement of paying \$600,000,000 of amounts due to disabled veterans and veterans benefits.

You know you are going to make that up, that's another postponement. You cut \$230,000,000 out of funds appropriated for power. You cut \$340,000,000, or postponed \$340,000,000 worth of payments that have to be made for civil service retirement. You dropped \$225,000,000 out of the stock piling of strategic material. When you get all through, you find that you haven't economized. You have either postponed or you bought less fighting equipment in a world that I think everyone knows is most uncertain.

Congressman Scott: Senator Monroney, were you against all these cuts?

Senator Monroney: I was certainly against the defense cut. I voted against it; I voted against the foreign aid cuts because I do not believe that we can possibly afford a trillion dollar war and I certainly would not vote to cut 143 wings down to 120 wings or to cut the North Atlantic Treaty armies which Eisenhower himself said should have 100 divisions down to 60 divisions.

Congressman Scott: Don't you think that President Eisenhower knows more about how much we need for NATO than you and I, for instance?

Senator Monroney: Then why did he change when he needed 100 divisions, in his own statement, last year, and now that Charles

Wilson is Secretary of Defense we wind up with 60?

Congressman Scott: Mike, do you think we can possibly spend more than 48 billion dollars for defense this year?

Senator Monroney: I certainly think we can if it is going to help us prevent the outbreak of world war III, an atomic war.

Congressman Scott: Let me go back to the veterans if I may for just a moment, Gunnar. I recall Representative Phillips of California stating on the floor of the House that in this appropriation bill this year we have appropriated more money for veterans, more money for veterans hospitals, more money for veterans beds than was ever appropriated before in the history of the country, more than was asked for by President Eisenhower and more than was previously asked for by President Truman, and in spite of that greater appropriation for veterans we save \$14,000,000,000, 80 bucks per person.

Mr. Back: Gentlemen . . .

Senator Monroney: Just on that one point, you say that you cut the veterans budget 13 per cent below the Democratic budget, or a total of \$597,000,000.

Congressman Scott: I'll have to disagree with you on that.

Mr. Back: I want to get out of the finance committee for just a moment and tend to another point of disagreement between the two of you. Senator Monroney, you said that farm prices are going down and food is going up, a policy of drift you call this, and, Mr. Scott, I believe you said that the removal of controls as over wages and prices and so forth had encouraged confidence in the government while the cost of living had remained steady. May we return to

that, Senator Monroney or Congressman Scott?

Congressman Scott: It doesn't matter. If Mike wants to keep this pose on let him tell . . .

Senator Monroney: As a matter of fact, on the Democratic bill all controls expired on June 30. It was the Republicans that faced the problem of dropping part and continuing part, and you did continue part of them, I think very wisely so, as much of the economy couldn't be controlled, but we had written a termination date into the law.

Congressman Scott: We were told that prices would go through the roof if we took those controls off. They have changed by 1/10 of 1 per cent since we took them off.

Mr. Back: And your contention is, Senator Monroney, that farm prices are going down. Is that right?

Senator Monroney: Farm prices are going down. Farm income today is lower than it has been in the past four years and even dropping lower. Wheat went down considerably this last day or two.

Congressman Scott: They were steadily dropping during October, November, and December of the Truman Administration.

Senator Monroney: It didn't hit the low it is hitting today. And dollar steaks! It is hard for us to understand. We can produce those beautiful white-faced Herefords, why their faces are just as red, with the thought of meat selling for . . .

Congressman Scott: We politicians, you know, like to blame the other party for everything, but I will be doggoned if I think you can blame Eisenhower for the drought down in Texas.

Senator Monroney: Cattle were

pretty low before the drought hit down there, and the fact remains that we had no farm program. Everytime Secretary Benson makes a speech, farm prices drop again and people wonder when we are going to have a Secretary of Agriculture who does something for the farmers.

Congressman Scott: Mike, so far, have there been any changes in the farm program and the price support program under the Republican Administration from those which the Democrats instituted? If changes have occurred, what were they and what did they do?

Senator Monroney: The main difference is that you had an aggressive farm administration and an administration by the Department of Agriculture that gave warning to the speculators to lay off trying to knock the farmers' prices down to bankrupt levels.

Congressman Scott: We had a Denver lawyer named Charlie Brannan and the Brannan Plan that not even the Democrats would swallow.

Senator Monroney: I didn't vote for that either.

Mr. Back: Senator Monroney, I don't want to interrupt but I would like to call your attention to a Mr. John J. Casey of Arlington, Virginia, who wants to take part in this program by proxy. He is going to receive an up-to-date twenty-volume set of the American People's Encyclopedia because he has sent in the listener question on tonight's subject which we thought was the best. This is Mr. Casey's question offered to both of you and I know that you have answered it in part: "How much of the Administration's progress in the last six months was made possible only by Democratic support?" Let me turn to Congressman Scott first.

Congressman Scott: Well, I don't

know that I recall much that was made possible *only* by Democratic support. You see, Senator Monroney says we Democrats made it possible, but he never tells you whether all 47 Democrats voted for something or whether five Democrats voted and added that to 43 Republicans. It is all a question of degree. I would like to ask Mike if he can join me in a bi-partisan congratulation to Mr. Casey for striking it rich, though. I think we ought to congratulate him.

Mr. Back: Senator Monroney has turned over to about page twelve of his notes and I think he is ready for an answer.

Senator Monroney: Well, this might give an idea on that. On the Bohlen nomination, which I think was a vote of confidence of Dulles and President Eisenhower, for President Eisenhower and for Mr. Bohlen were 39 Democrats for him and 2 Democrats against him. There were 34 Republicans for him and 11 Republicans against him. On the foreign aid cut, we committed to cut another billion dollars off after 2 billion had been previously cut off. 26 Democrats voted for President Eisenhower and 13 voted against him. 21 Republicans voted for the President and 21 Republicans in the Senate voted against him. There was an even break on that and a very important issue.

You can go on to the House. You had something like that on the passage of the mutual authorization bill. You had 160 Democrats voting for the President and 27 against; you had 119 Republicans

voting for the President and 81 against and . . .

Congressman Scott: There's no doubt whatever that there are a number of Republicans who felt that the aid program should have been cut further than it was. I was not one of them. I have supported the program, but an interesting thing to me is the Bohlen question because that was touted as the proof that Senator McCarthy really ran the government, as the British seem to think he does, Senator McCarthy ran President Eisenhower as the Democrats would like the Americans to believe, and I don't know how big a sucker they can expect the public to believe, on the basis of that vote, because there Senator McCarthy led the fight against the Bohlen nomination.

He did everything he could to rally Republicans in opposition, and what did he get? He got ten Republicans out of the 47 or 48. That shows the strength of the so-called McCarthy group in the Senate, and I am not attacking Senator McCarthy personally. I am pointing out that he couldn't come up with the results when the chips were down. In a few minutes Senator Monroney is apt to forget himself and say that the big issue is McCarthyism, so I thought I would answer it early.

Senator Monroney: All I said was that the big headline on the 83rd Congress seems to be McCarthyism. The Republicans are in control of the majority and they should accept the responsibility.

QUESTIONS, PLEASE!

Mr. Back: We are about to go into the vast field of McCarthyism, but I want to go to the floor for questions now and I don't doubt in the least we shall have a question on that. So this young lady will begin with a question for you, I think, Congressman.

Questioner: Congressman Scott, what economic good has been accomplished by the high interest policy instituted by the Treasury Department?

Congressman Scott: Why the policy of the previous Administration for many years has been to have easy credit, to have interest rates extremely low, to use the taxpayers' money to shore up the value of government bonds so that those people who hold U. S. bonds will have them protected at the expense of all the taxpayers, whether they hold them or not.

The purpose of increasing the interest rates, which are not high interest rates at all, but to increase the interest rates into the 3 and 4 per cent bracket from the 2 and $2\frac{1}{2}$ per cent bracket, has been to keep the credit of the country solvent, to hold the line on the dollar, to make the dollar stand still long enough so you can buy something with it, and to put an end to this inflation which has eaten away about half of your weekly pay in the last 8 or 12 years. In that period most people have lost about half their pay through inflation.

Mr. Back: Senator Monroney, I know that you want to say something.

Senator Monroney: Rather briefly, when you raise government interest rates, all other interest rates go up and it has cost the con-

sumers of America many times what it has cost the government, and it has cost the government a great deal. We have seen the home-building business, one of the most progressive and profitable, practically frozen because real estate mortgage money has disappeared. Farm credit has gone out of existence and little business has suffered greatly.

Questioner: Senator Monroney, what percentage of the Democrats in Congress supported President Eisenhower's position on off-shore oil rather than that of their own candidate in the last campaign?

Senator Monroney: I can't give you those figures completely. About the only Democrats we lost were those from the tideland oil states. I think it would number less than 10 or 12 out of the total number, while the Republicans, all from states other than those who would benefit by the title being passed to the states, voted almost solidly for giving title to off-shore oil to the states, as a result of the campaign issue I guess that had been raised by President Eisenhower.

Congressman Scott: Just to show how misleading the off-shore oil question is, a geography professor in a Midwestern university asked me what was really going on down there and was completely surprised to know that all this controversy refers to is 10 per cent of present production and 10 per cent of potential production of oil in the so-called tidal areas which is reserved for the states under their ancient treaties, and treaties are still as good as any other contract. Approximately 90 per cent of the production and potential of the oil resources of the country

are represented by the so-called continental shelf which lies beyond the 3½ or ten-mile limit as the case may be, and all of that is reserved to the federal government, which means that any royalties that come go to reducing their taxes. That's not bad.

Senator Monroney: Perhaps the estimate of 8 to 15 billion in wealth given to the tidelands states is only a fraction of the offshore oil, but it is awfully important money to the other 48 states, because the Supreme Court three times held that it was the property of all the states and not the tidelands oil states.

Questioner: Congressman Scott, what effect will the end of the Korean war have on employment?

Congressman Scott: Well, according to the various business surveys and *Business Week*, and the rest of these papers that know more about it than I do, it is not expected that it will have any adverse effects so far as can be foreseen. The war is over, and they say on the stock market that peace is bullish, that peace means good news for this reason. We have stopped shooting everything away which people make out of the sweat of their brows and we begin making consumer goods.

All of the factories that are engaged in defense activities will do one of two things. They will continue to use up this \$48,000,000,000 and continue to keep us strong in defense or some of them will be able to change over to making refrigerators or consumer goods of one kind or another. There has been no evidence whatever that the peace is a bad thing. And I do to heaven we will never in this country come to regard peace as an evil.

Mr. Back: Thank you, Congressman Scott. The next question.

Questioner: Mr. Scott, why is the Eisenhower Administration allowing Senator McCarthy to scuttle the Republican Party?

Congressman Scott: I think I have answered that. I don't think anybody in the Senate, Republican or Democrat, is big enough to scuttle the Republican party or to scuttle the Republican Administration. If ever a man gets that big I would tremble for the country, but I have seen no evidence of scuttling when one fellow corrals 11 votes and the other side gets about 36.

Mr. Back: Thank you, Congressman. Here is a young man in uniform.

Questioner: Senator Monroney, can the Korean truce be claimed as an Administration accomplishment until promises and commitments made to South Korea are concurred in by Congress?

Senator Monroney: That is a very good question indeed. If the commitments made to Korea involve a ratification of a joint defense pact to resume fighting after ninety days, I am almost certain Congress would not authorize or approve such a treaty. We hope that in the negotiations Secretary Dulles, and I believe he did leave a clear understanding we would not resume fighting to unify Korea if negotiations broke down. But if the North Koreans or the Red Chinese again attack, then that is a different question, and I would not be surprised to see the United Nations resume some kind of military action.

Questioner: Representative Hugh Scott, what are the chances for the repeal of the Taft-Hartley Law by the next Congress?

Congressman Scott: None whatever. However, I want to give you a complete answer to what may be done. The Taft-Hartley Act has been subjected to criticism by management, labor, and government in some respects. No law is perfect. The Congress sits there to change laws all the time. The reason we have held Taft-Hartley revision, the changes in it, until the next session is because the President has had the chairmen of the two labor committees and the House and Senate frequently meeting with him, with union labor leaders, with management.

It is intended that when the revision of the Taft-Hartley Law is set up in September of this year, for action next year, it is hoped and intended that the revisions proposed will be satisfactory to labor and management and government. And it is my judgment that that will happen, and no other administration can make this statement.

Questioner: Senator Monroney, do you believe that the Republican economy program will seriously weaken our national defense?

Senator Monroney: I think it has already weakened our national defense. We have lost almost six months in which many funds previously appropriated were frozen. Many new designs for aircraft and military equipment were not laid down or prototypes built, and we not only have this six months lost but we have the next six months lost plus the loss of about 10 billion dollars in funds that I think were necessary to build up Uncle Sam's muscle and might.

Mr. Back: Thank you, Senator. This gentleman?

Questioner: Congressman Scott, when President Eisenhower recently summarized his Administration's accomplishments, he omitted

the tidelands oil bill. How do you explain this rather significant omission?

Congressman Scott: Well, I referred to it later, I believe. I think I have answered it, but you have given me an opportunity to point out exactly what we did do. Eisenhower promised to do eleven things. I will tell you the seven which have already been done in the first session of Congress. The other four I predict will happen in the next session. I don't want to sound like a certain famous commentator, "I predict," but this is what we have done.

We promised to recognize the Executive branch, prompt action on appropriation bills, legislation on the submerged oil lands, extension of the reciprocal trade acts, simplification of customs procedures, limited extension of controls and allocation, extension of temporary aid to schools in critical areas, all seven of which we have done.

We have postponed until the next session statehood for Hawaii, revision of the Taft-Hartley Act, extension of old-age and survivors insurance and addition of two commissioners for the District of Columbia. And as to old-age and survivors insurance, the message from the President the other day proposes that it be extended to ten and a half million more people than were ever covered under any Democratic administration, including professional people, self-employed and farmers.

Mr. Back: Senator Monroney, the Congressman had a rather long session there, perhaps I had better turn to you. Do you have any comment?

Senator Monroney: Well, I repeat what I said earlier that they have packed up on the back of the stove an awful load of work for an

election year Congress when they will be trying to adjourn about the fourth of July. We have social security, revision of Taft-Hartley, doing something about reciprocal trade. They didn't do anything about it, they merely extended it on a temporary basis for a year. They have the most unearthly load of work for an election year that Congress has ever . . .

Congressman Scott: Mike, we quit earlier than you do. And I predict—we have done more work in this session than the Democrats usually do—and I predict that we will chew up the rest of our bite in a second session.

Mr. Back: The Senator keeps fussing on that matter of delaying social security, Congressman Scott. Do you want to comment on that specifically?

Congressman Scott: Yes, simply because we first had to put our house in order, we had to find out

how many bills Mr. Truman left unpaid, we had to find out what we owed, we had to find out what the income was. We couldn't trust the estimates of the outgoing Treasury, headed by Mr. Snyder. We just plain had to find where we stood and how much we could save before we could overhaul the social security system or the tax system.

Senator Monroney: I think it is rather peculiar that now the Republicans come in and say they didn't know anything about the situation they were talking about last year. They made themselves experts.

Congressman Scott: You kept it hidden under the rug as well as you could. At least you think you did.

Mr. Back: Thank you, gentlemen, for your most informative discussion. I am sorry to have to terminate it at this point.

FOR FURTHER STUDY OF THIS WEEK'S TOPIC

Background Questions

1. How do the achievements of the Eisenhower Administration to date compare with—campaign promises, Republican platform pledges, the President's State of the Union recommendations?

FOREIGN AFFAIRS

1. Does the foreign policy of Eisenhower and Dulles differ radically from that of Truman and Acheson?
2. Can the Korean truce be attributed to any specific changes in our foreign policy? If so, what are they? Or, has the truce resulted primarily from changes within the Soviet orbit?
3. Did Pres. Eisenhower's revision of orders to the U. S. Seventh Fleet in Formosan waters and freeing of Chinese Nationalists to raid the mainland have any appreciable effect on our position in the Far East?
4. Evaluate the liberation versus containment controversy in the light of recent developments behind the Iron Curtain. What has the Administration done to exploit this situation?

FOREIGN AID AND TRADE

1. Were recent cuts in appropriations for foreign aid desirable? Or, will they damage the effectiveness of the program?
2. Was a year's renewal of the Reciprocal Trade Agreements Act the most that could have been accomplished toward freer trade?

NATIONAL AFFAIRS

1. Are cuts in appropriations for defense, especially for the Air Force, within the margin of national safety? Do they necessitate a revision of our defense goals?
2. Evaluate the Administration's preference for indirect control of the money supply over direct price-wage controls as an anti-inflation policy.
3. How much progress has been made toward balancing the budget and the reduction of taxes?
4. Was the President right in asking for a raise in the statutory debt limit?
5. Does the approval for over-quota admission of 214,000 refugees foreshadow a major revision of immigration policy? Or, is there too much opposition to such revision?
6. What stand has the Eisenhower Administration taken on the public versus private power controversy?
 - a. Pres. Eisenhower cited T. V. A. as an example of what he meant by "creeping socialism." Is this consistent with his campaign statements?
 - b. Sec'y. of the Interior, McKay, announced that his Dept. was withdrawing opposition before the Federal Power Commission to the Idaho Power Co.'s plan to build three dams on Snake River. Do you approve of this action?
7. Evaluate the following:
 - a. abolition of the R. F. C. and creation of Small Business Administration
 - b. authorized disposal of 29 government-owned synthetic rubber plants
 - c. Grant of title to submerged lands and offshore oil to coastal states
 - d. creation of a Dept. of Health, Education and Welfare
 - e. reorganization of the Defense Dept., other reorganization plans
8. What items of "must" legislation promised by the Administration (e. g. expansion of social security, statehood for Hawaii, etc.) have not been acted upon? What are their chances during the next session?
9. What has the Administration accomplished thus far in the field of civil rights?
10. Vice-Pres. Nixon has stated that restoration of the people's confidence in Government has been the greatest accomplishment of the Administration in its first six months in office. Do you agree?
11. During the campaign, Eisenhower often spoke of this country's need for positive leadership? Has he demonstrated such leadership during his first months in office?
 - a. Is the careful restudying of the programs of the past few decades now being done, an important prerequisite to constructive leadership?
 - b. Has the President taken a consistently strong stand on civil liberties?
 - c. Does the growth of the President's responsibility in past decades demand an executive program that embraces the whole range of legislation?

THE PRESIDENT AND CONGRESS

1. Evaluate Pres. Eisenhower's relationship with the Congress.
 - a. Should a new President, so overwhelmingly favored by the electorate, have received more active Congressional support?
 - b. In cultivating good relations with Congress has Eisenhower unnecessarily yielded to the diehards in his own party?